



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

royal library at Berlin, marked XK 1410, seemingly the oldest, XK 1013, and XK 1500 in vol. I of a collection made by Braunfels. I am unable to say whether they are identical with those known to Dr. Buchanan, or whether they deserve collating with the text of the edition of 1636. Judging from the usual *suelta*, I should not say that they do.

The second volume promises us a discussion of the relation of *la vida es sueño* to *el Príncipe Don Carlos* by Enciso. As I knew very little about this subject when I wrote my article in *Mod. Lang. Notes* quite a number of years ago, and, in fact, *más valiera callarlo que decirlo*, know but little more about it now, it will be interesting to see Dr. Buchanan's conclusions. Dr. Wickersham Crawford, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1907, pp. 238 ff., mentions a manuscript by Cañizares, which he calls an autograph and which is therefore supposed to solve the question of the revamped *Príncipe Don Carlos* as found in a *suelta* of 1773. Isn't it rather one of a large number of prompter's copies? There are three in the Municipal library of Madrid, and a collation alone of all will solve the question of the authorship of this *rifacimento*. The number of the bundle containing the prompter's copies is, I think, thirteen, and I never had the courage to examine them in detail.

RUDOLPH SCHEVILL.

Yale University.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO ELIZABETHAN STAGE HISTORY.

The past few years have yielded an unusual harvest in the field of Elizabethan drama. Professor Schelling's book¹ is, of course, in a class by itself as the first adequate and separate treatment of the period from the point of view of the plays themselves. Besides this, however, there has been a group of publications dealing with the external history of the drama of the period; and the accumulation of material, documentary and critical,

has been so rapid that the time seems near at hand for a continuous and fairly adequate history of the Elizabethan stage,—public, the so-called "private," and at the court. Mr. W. W. Grey has completed his series of three volumes,² I. The Text of Henslowe's Diary, II. Notes and Glossary, III. The Alieyn Papers, and has thus provided a safe text and appliances for using one of the most significant and perplexing of all Elizabethan dramatic records. Mr. Thompson's *The Puritans and the Stage*³ has been supplemented by Miss Gildersleeve's *Government Regulation of Elizabethan Drama*⁴ and Mr. Wallace's *Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*,⁵ Miss Gildersleeve's book especially making vivid the continuous conflict of City Fathers and Puritanism on one hand, with royal and popular zeal for the drama on the other. Mr. Wallace's chief preoccupation has been with the significance of the Chapel Children in the dramatic activity of the times, and he announces his book to be the first of a series treating comprehensively the history of the child companies. Mr. Chambers, whose previous publications have given him the right to speak with much authority, has attacked⁶ the date claimed by Mr. Wallace for the beginning of the children's performances at Blackfriars, and thinks that their career, far from being so brilliant as Mr. Wallace suggests, was ingloriously subject to royal disfavour and interruption, because of their manager's indiscretion in the choice of plays and in other ways. Mr. Chambers would tend too to minimize the influence of this company upon other companies and theatres, and, perhaps unintentionally, leaves one with an added conviction that Mr. Wallace's zeal for his subject has dulled his sense of proportion. Mr. Wallace's conclusions, must in the present writer's opinion, inevitably be subjected to some deduction, and yet he seems to have made his main point, which concerns not only the successes and influence of the Chapel Children,

² W. W. Grey, *The Text of —*.

³ *The Puritans and the Stage*. E. N. S. Thompson, 1903.

⁴ *Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama*. Virginia Gildersleeve. *Columbia University Studies in English*, 1908.

⁵ *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*. W. W. Wallace. *University of Nebraska Studies*, 1908.

⁶ *Modern Language Review*, January, 1909.

¹ *History of Elizabethan Drama*. Felix E. Schelling, 1908.

but the Queen's interest in them as a link between the drama of the Court and that of the popular stage. He is not, to be sure, quite convincing in his claims that Elizabeth herself attended the Children's performances at Blackfriars or that she was busy in making it a model for the public theatres, but he does create a strong probability of the directness of royal favour and assistance in the inauguration and maintenance of the company there, as also for the influence of stage conditions at Blackfriars upon other theatres during the Children's occupancy of this theatre. He cites an impressive array too of the greater dramatists who wrote for them and of well known plays shaped to suit their possibilities as actors; and in spite of our inevitable protest against his over-emphasis, makes us feel that a study of the plays written for children, taken separately from others, might yield interesting results. His book itself, being the record of a private theatre, furnishes the link in stage history, between the public theatres of London, and the Court theatres under the supervision of the Office of the Revels.

For the Court drama specifically, recent publications have not been less significant. Since more than a century ago, beginning with the contributions of Chalmers⁷ and of Malone,⁸ Elizabethan documents or fragments of documents bearing on the subject, have been appearing, but the publications have been scattered, often hard to secure, and so unfortunate in the editing that one has frequently been at a loss whether to accept any part of the editor's work as trustworthy. In 1906, however, Mr. Chambers began a better order of things by his *Notes on the Tudor Revels*,⁹ which, carefully reproduced in whole or in part, various important Revels documents, and sifted the evidence in regard to several problems of the Court drama. More recently M. Albert Feuillerat has done a much greater service by collecting into one careful volume all available documents relating to the Revels in the time of Queen Elizabeth. The documents are drawn from various repositories, many from the Public Record

Office, London; others from the British Museum, &c., and the editor regards the collection as exhaustive, so far as extant material is concerned. The volume is announced as the first of a series which is to include all documents relating to English Court drama, whether before printed or not. The plan includes four volumes, the present one, for reasons of special convenience printed first, though third in the chronology of the documents involved; a second, dealing with the Revels in the time of Edward VI and of Mary; a third, with the Court Festivities under Henry VIII; and a fourth with the Revels in the days of the Stuarts. The second volume is declared in the Preface to this one to be already completed.

M. Feuillerat does not claim to have brought to light much new material. Most of his documents as he explains, Collier¹⁰ and Cunningham¹¹ have come upon before himself, though he might have pointed out that Malone, Chalmers, and others had preceded these in finding a good deal of the material. He himself, however, has made valuable and interesting additions to the collection, some of them having a strong independent interest, as the Inventory of the Office of the Revels in 1560, and certain petitions in the Appendix; whereas others are valuable as filling out the Accounts of the Revels Office into a practically continuous record. M. Feuillerat's chief concern, however, has been to present carefully edited texts for both the known and the newly found documents, and so to provide solid foundations for scholarly work in the history of the Court drama. He has been especially careful to avoid the faults of Collier and Cunningham, restoring some of the Elizabethan spelling neglected by the latter, and adding much which one or the other of them failed to transcribe. An example of his fuller text will be found by comparing *Revels Documents*, p. 47, with Cunningham's *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels* (Shakespeare Society, 1842), p. 16. A difference in another direction is found in M. Feuillerat's omission of a page cited by Cunningham.¹² This page the

⁷*An Apology for Believers*, &c. Chalmers. *A Supplemental Apology for Believers*. Chalmers.

⁸*History of the Stage*. Vol. III. First Variorum Shakespeare, ed. Edmund Malone, 1791.

⁹*Notes on the Tudor Revels*. E. K. Chambers, 1906.

¹⁰*A History of English Dramatic Literature*. J. P. Collier.

¹¹*Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels*. P. Cunningham. Shakespeare Society, 1842.

¹²In the *Accounts from 31 October to 1 March, 1573-4*, p. 456.

later editor thinks has certainly been lost since Cunningham copied it, and we are relieved to be spared a new ascription of forgery on the part of Cunningham. Indeed, M. Feuillerat's review of the latter's work tends on the whole to help his good name, though the same cannot be said for Collier. M. Feuillerat has given much time to adjusting relations between the records of the various sorts, as those of the Revels Office itself, the Declared Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, the Acts of the Privy Council, the Imprest Certificate Books, &c., and he has analyzed with great care the conclusions of earlier workers in this connection, with the result that he differs from Mr. Chambers in various points of detail, as of the date of the survey of St. John of Jerusalem, the seat of the Revels; that Thos. Blagrave was appointed by privy seal; and from earlier critics in general, as to the date of the death of Sir Thomas Benger, Master of the Revels.

The editorial method followed is intelligent and on the whole convincing in its wisdom, although it does not attempt the exactness of absolute reproduction. For example, the Auditor's notes on the Accounts are retained or omitted at the editor's discretion, and all abbreviations are drawn out into the full spelling for the convenience of the reader, the change being indicated by italicising the letters added. On the other hand, a great deal of effort has been given to distinguishing one handwriting from another in the entries of changes by the Revels Officers, the difference being marked by a change of type, with the asterisk to call attention to the reason for change.

The collection of documents is divided into two parts, with a valuable appendix, full notes and various indexes subjoined. The usual introductory discussion of the matter of the text is deferred as being bulky enough to require a separate volume. Part I includes under the title, *The Office and Officers*, ten documents, among them, a new and most interesting Inventory of the Stuff of the Revels Office taken in 1860, A Survey of the Seat of the Revels Office. Part II presents the Accounts themselves, and various warrants.

The Appendix, made up of both old and new material, is perhaps the part fullest of human interest, as it contains chiefly of com-

plaints or petitions and throws many side lights on the loose management of the office and the consequent inconvenience to those involved. There is the somewhat amusing complaint of Thomas Gylles against the Yeoman of the Revels for lending the costumes of the Revels far and wide, with "the red clothe of golde gownes" which were lent "to a taylor marrying in the blakfryer" and to various others of humble station and questionable neatness, until the garments are unfit for the noble masquers who are wont to use them. There is a petition from the Yeoman himself too, calling attention to "sarten thinges which are very nedefull to be Redressed in the Office of the Revelles" and showing the consequent discredit that was coming to the office from every side, "which thing," the complainant adds mournfully, "for my part I am very sorry to see." But the petition which draws us most is the well-known one in which "the poore creditours themselves most needefully desire payment" of money now more than two years due.

Of the illuminating effect of such a collection of documents, one could hardly say too much, and it is because of the mass and variety of material presented in M. Feuillerat's volume that the impression of life is so vivid and convincing. Heretofore there have been only suggestions, or snatches of impressions, now the life stands revealed. And it is not merely the story of the Court drama itself, but of all the force of labourers who made it possible, the variety of work and of workmen conspiring to the one great end, the many shopkeepers coming and going, the hours and wages of labour, the part of the children in the task of amusement, the wretched management of the office, the barrenness of the Queen's Exchequer, and all the rest. In what concerns chiefly the history of the drama itself, one is once more impressed with the large elaborateness of Court staging, for plays and actors coming from the public theatres, and one gains an added conviction that modern critics as well as Mr. Ben Greet, have been too ready to believe that actors would have been content to shift back and forth between barrenness and a surprisingly elaborate stage. One wonders whether M. Feuillerat's deferred introduction will not do something to prove a fuller equipment for the public Elizabethan stage.

We might note too, though as a digression, the rapid accumulation of discoveries and studies tending to make real and vivid to us the Elizabethan life which the dramatists presented in their plays, and of which they were themselves a part. Professor Wallace's recent discoveries in the Public Record Office, London, are the most significant as throwing light on Shakespeare's London residence and social relations during the years when some of his greatest plays were being written, making clear his neighborly instinct, his sympathy with young and old, and his contact with a French household while he was writing *Henry V*; making plausible too, a host of sentimental inferences so tempting that writers are already busy upon them.¹³ Mr. A. W. Pollard's *Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos, A Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays 1594-1635*,¹⁴ tells the story of the publication of the quartos and folios, explains conditions governing publications in Shakespeare's day, laws regulating licenses, &c., and contributes insight if not a large bulk of new material. There are various books too, of the type of *The Elizabethan People*,¹⁵ by Henry Thew Stephenson, and *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age*,¹⁶ the last much more contributive than Mr. Stephenson's book but both helping in the appaeciatiion of the age, of the economic, social and other conditions which prevailed, and especially of that elusive compound, the Elizabethan spirit.

When one considers not only Professor Wallace's Shakespearian discoveries noted above, but earlier ones published or reported at various times by him,¹⁷

¹³ The necessity for caution in such inferences is, however, already suggested by Professor Bruce's timely reminder in *The Nation*, March 12, that the name *Mowntjoy* or *Montjoy* is found already in Holinshed, one of Shakespeare's sources, though not in the other and later, *The Famous Victories*.

¹⁴ Methuen Co., 1909.

¹⁵ Published by Henry Holt & Co., 1910.

¹⁶ Publications of the University of Manchester, English Series, 1, University Press, Manchester, 1909.

¹⁷ *The Newly Discovered Shakespeare Documents in University of Nebraska Studies*, 1905, and *Englische Studien*, April, 1906; certain documents concerning Blackfriars Theatre, announced—1906, *The New York Times*; *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars in University of Nebraska Studies*, 1908; *Recasting the History of Shakespeare in The New York Times*, October 3, 1909.

and still others, by other scholars, conveniently cited by Mr. Sidney Lee in the preface of his 1908 edition of his *Life of William Shakespeare*, there seems ground for hoping that we may grow into fairly vivid realization not only of the man Shakespeare himself, but of the theatrical circle and special stage history which are of supreme interest because of their relation to him. The future historian of the Elizabethan stage must find himself immensely richer than he could otherwise have been, by reason of the very recent acquisitions of scholars; and while we may differ from Mr. Wallace at times, as to relative values, no one will be slow to grant that his discoveries are among the most interesting and significant that modern searchers have brought to light.

O. L. HATCHER.

Bryn Mawr College.

A NOTE ON *BEOWULF* 1142-1145.

My attention has been drawn by a note in the new edition of Holthausen's *Beowulf* (vol. II, p. xxviii f.), to some interesting observations by Dr. R. Imelmann, of Bonn, as to lines 1142-1145 of *Beowulf*, in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* of 17 April, 1909. Imelmann considers that Hunlafing is the name of a brother of Guthlaf and Oslaf (= the Ordlaif of *Finn'sburg* 18), and that he joined them in helping Hengest to revenge himself on Finn and carry off Hildeburh. The name occurs in a late Brut-version (Cott. Vesp. D iv) at fol. 139b:—

"In diebus illis, imperante Valentiniano, regnum barbarorum et germanorum exortum est, turgentisque populi et nationes per totam Europam consederunt. Hoc testantur gesta Rodulphi et *Hunlapi*, Unwini et Widie, Horsi et Hengisti, Waltef et Hame, quorum quidam in Italia, quidam in Gallia, alii in Britannia, ceteri vero in Germania armis et rebus bellicis claruerunt."

He also quotes Chadwick, *Origins of the English Nation*, 1907, p. 52, as pointing out that in the *Skiplunga Saga* three of the seven sons of the Danish King Leifus are called *Hunleifus*, *Oddleifus* and *Gunnleifus*; and René Huchon (*Revue*